

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 28 and 30 are currently being amended.

Claims 57-59 are currently being added.

This amendment adds and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After adding and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 28-31, 38, 39 and 55-59 are now pending in this application, whereby claims 38, 39 and 56 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected species.

Claim Rejections – Indefiniteness:

In the Office Action, claims 28-31 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite, for the reasons set forth on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. By way of this amendment and reply, independent claims 28 and 30 have been amended to recite that the several types of information contained in a packet and the one or more type of information related to a packet transfer method are registered in the packet transfer method database as a one-to-one correspondence with respect to a URL data entry, a destination IP address data entry, a VLAN ID data entry, a source IP address data entry, a destination MAC address data entry, and a VLAN-ID data entry. See, for example, Figure 7 of the drawings and the description of that figure in the specification. Claim 28 has also been amended to recite “the one or more type of information provided to said packet transfer equipment as the information related to the packet transfer method . . .”, to address the other indefiniteness rejection of that claim. Thus, presently pending claims 28-31 and 55 are now believed to fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,985,964 to Petersen in view of U.S. Patent Publication

No. 2002/0038339 to Xu; claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Xu and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,777 to Ebrahim; claim 30 was rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebrahim in view of Xu and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0031142 to Metin; and claim 31 was rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Xu and Metin and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,139,838 to Squire. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

With respect to the rejection of claim 28, that claim recites that the several types of information contained in a packet include URL data, destination IP address data, and VLAN-ID data, and wherein the one or more type of information related to a packet transfer method that are registered include source IP address data, destination MAC address data, and VLAN-ID data. Such features can be found in Figure 7 of the drawings and in the description of that figure in the specification. Those features that are included in the packet transfer method database, are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Petersen or by Xu.

Petersen describes a network processor system which can intervene and modify the handling of packets based on its interpretation of peripheral processor results. The Office Action asserts that column 3, lines 53-54 of Petersen describes the features corresponding to the claimed packet transfer method database, but this assertion is incorrect. Namely, column 3, lines 53-54 of Petersen merely describes that packet routing lookups can be performed by a search engine 140, such as the well-known OSI Layer 2, Layer 3, and/or Layer 4 lookups. Such features fall well short of the specific features recited in claim 28 concerning the specific types of information stored in the claimed packet transfer method database.

Page 4 of the Office Action recognizes this deficiency of Peterson, and asserts that Xu describes the specific type of information located in a packet information database. For example, neither Figure 6B nor paragraphs 0106 to 0115 of Xu describe that a VLAN-ID as an input packet information and a VLAN-ID as a packet transfer method are stored in his table 632.

Accordingly, since Xu does not teach or suggest all of the specific types of information stored in the claimed packet transfer method database recited in claim 28, and since Peterson does not rectify these deficiencies of Xu, claim 28 is patentable over the combined teachings of Peterson and Xu.

Also, claim 28 now recites a one-to-one correspondence for the information stored in the claimed packet transfer method database (see Figure 7 of the drawings, for example), whereby the table 632 of Xu, as clearly shown in Figure 6B of that reference, shows a one-to-many correspondence of certain information types. See, for example, the Dest. IP Address W1 that maps to three different elements for Destination System Type (Loopback, Alias, Nat).

Accordingly, for this additional reason, independent claim 28 is patentable over the combined teachings of Peterson and Xu.

For similar reasons as provided above with respect to independent claim 28, and since Metin does not rectify the above-mentioned deficiencies of Xu, independent claim 30 is patentable over the combined teachings of Peterson, Xu and Metin.

New Claims:

New claims 57-59 have been added. New claims 57 and 59 recite features of a second packet transfer method database that are shown in Figure 8 of the drawings and described on page 46 of the specification, whereby such features are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record, when taken as a whole. New claim 58 is similar to claim 55, but it depends from independent claim 30.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 6, 2009

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819